



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During a telephone conversation with Anne Lee and Tom Feix, they argued that the Richardson reference does not teach the orientation of the first and second legs as disclosed in claims 58, 79, 97, and 118. They also argued that the legs (21b, 22b) do not extend inwardly in the longitudinal x-axis towards the occlusion direction from the first and second side portions, respectively. The arguments were supported by an in depth explanation of the orientation of the claimed first and second legs of claims 58, 79, 97, and 118. In response, the Examiner will reconsidered his position on the rejection of claims 58, 63-79, 82, 84-97, and 102-118 in light of the arguments presented herein and perform further search and consideration.